



Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: Called applicant's representative and asked to amend base claims 1, 11, 16 and 19 to avoid possible objection of the claims regarding the language of the limitation "and (iv) each concave edge has a radius which is at least twice as large in value as every convex edge." Decided to add the word "radius of" before every convex edge. Also, asked to amend the base claims 1, 11, 16 and 19 by adding the limitation of the detail of the mask (as claimed in the claim 6) to more clearly recite the invention and to further overcome the prior art of record. Applicant's representative gave authorization to amend the claims by examiner's amendments. Further, it was confirmed that claims 33-37, as stated on line 9 on page 9 of response filed on February 3, 2006, are not there. It was just a typographical mistake.